

REMARKS

The Office Action has been received and reviewed. In light of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Claims 5-7, 15, 17-19, 26, 33, and 36 are currently pending in the application. Claims 20 and 38 are canceled.

Claims 5, 26 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,671,223 to Shacher et al. (“Shacher”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,788,652 to Hwang (“Hwang”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,525 to Aggarwal et al. (“Aggarwal”). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shacher in view of Aggarwal. Claims 7, 17-20, 36 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shacher in view of Aggarwal and further in view of W. Simpson RFC 1662 (“W. Simpson”). Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shacher in view of W. Simpson.

The present invention is “a deframer for a wireless communication device to recover Point-to-Point Protocol (PPP) packet data which has been framed in Radio Link Protocol (RLP) packets.” (Claim 5; all independent claims contain similar limitations) Accordingly, the present invention takes PPP packets and frames them into RLP packets for wireless transmission; and vice-versa. The PPP packets (which are typically used in wired networks) are not normally compatible with RLP packets (which are typically used in cellular networks).

First, the Examiner relies upon Shacher to meet the present invention’s input interface unit. (Office Action page 2) However, Shacher is directed to a wired network; whereas the present claims recite “an input interface unit operative to wirelessly receive data.” Shacher is simply not applicable to wireless communications. Likewise, Aggarwal is also only applicable to wired networks.

Second, the Examiner concedes that Shacher does not expressly disclose RLP packets or a conversion unit; and instead relies upon Hwang to meet these limitations. Although Hwang does disclose a likely equivalent to RLP packets and the extraction of message data from the

RLP packets, it does not teach a conversion unit for converting (deframing) RLP packets into PPP packet data as required in the present claims.

Moreover, because wired PPP packets and wireless RLP packets are incompatible there would be no reason for a person skilled in the art to combine Shacher's and Hwang's teachings. Regardless, neither reference discloses deframing RLP packets to recover PPP packets as required in the present claims.

Similarly, W. Simpson fails to meet the same limitations as discussed above. Therefore, for at least these reasons, any combination of Shacher, Hwang, Aggarwal and W. Simpson fails to obviate the present invention and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 21, 2008

By: /Darren M. Simon, Reg. No. 47,946/

Darren M. Simon, Reg. No. 47,946
(858) 845-2472

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502